

REP 1001 vs HSV-1





FIG. 1a

REP2001 vs HSV-1



REP3007 vs HSV-1




FIG. 1c

Oligo size versus IC50 (HSV-1)





FIG. 2


REP 2001 vs HSV-1

FIG. 3a




REP 2002 vs HSV-1

FIG. 3b




REP 2003 vs HSV-1

FIG. 3c




REP 2004 vs HSV-1

FIG. 3d




REP 2005 vs HSV-1

FIG. 3e




REP 2006 vs HSV-1

FIG. 3f



acyclovir vs HSV-1

FIG. 3g



Oligo size versus IC50 (HSV-1)




FIG. 4

REP 2003 vs HSV-1




FIG. 5a

REP 2009 vs HSV-1





FIG. 5b

REP 2010 vs HSV-1






FIG. 5d

REP 2012 vs HSV-1




FIG. 5e

REP 2004 vs KOS




FIG. 5f




FIG. 5g

REP 2007 vs HSV-1




FIG. 5h

REP 2008 vs KOS




FIG. 5i




FIG. 6




FIG. 7





FIG. 8d






FIG. 8e

REP 2018 vs HSV-1




FIG. 8f

REP 2019 vs HSV-1




FIG. 8g

REP2020 vs HSV-1





FIG. 8h

REP 2121 vs HSV-1






FIG. 9




FIG. 10

REP 2024 vs HSV-1




FIG. 11a

REP 2026 vs HSV-1




FIG. 11b

REP 2059 vs HSV-1




FIG. 11c

REP 2060 vs HSV-1




FIG. 11d

REP 1001 vs HSV-2




FIG. 12a

REP2001 vs HSV-2





FIG. 12b

REP3007 vs HSV-2



Oligo size versus IC50 (HSV-2)




FIG. 13

REP 2001 vs HSV-2 y = -61.449x + 28.078120 % of plaques relative to untreated cells R² = 0.9625 100 IC50 = 0.439 uM 80 FIG. 14a 60 40 20 0 -1.5 0.5 -0.5 0 -1 log [drug] (uM) REP 2002 vs HSV-2 120 100 % of plaques relative to untreated cells 80 60 FIG. 14b 40 20 1.5 1 0.5 -0.5 0 -1 log [drug] (uM) **REP 2003 vs HSV-2** 120 100 % of plaques relative to untreated cells 80 FIG. 14c 60 40 20 1.5 0.5 0 -0.5 -1 log [drug] (uM) REP 2004 (MS2) 120 y = -57.908x + 49.026100 $R^2 = 0.9715$ % of plaques relative to untreated cells 1C50 = 0.86 uM 80 60 FIG. 14d 40 20

1.5

0


-0.5


-1

0.5

log [drug] (uM)


REP 2005 vs HSV-2 120 y = -120.5x - 51.631 % of plaques relative to 100 $R^2 = 1$ untreated cells 80 FIG. 14e IC50 = 0.14 uM 60 40 20 0 0.5 1 -0.5 0 -1 log [drug] (uM)





1.5

FIG. 14g



Oligo size versus IC50 (HSV-2)




FIG. 15






FIG. 16a

REP 2006 vs CMV




FIG. 16b

Oligo size vs IC50 (CMV)




FIG. 16c

Gancyclovir vs CMV




FIG. 17a

Foscarnet vs CMV




FIG. 17b

Cidofovir vs CMV




FIG. 17c

REP 2003 vs CMV






FIG. 17d

REP 2004 vs CMV



REP 2006 vs CMV










FIG. 17g

REP 2036 (Vitravene) vs CMV



REP 2036 (commercial Vitravene) vs CMV



Oligo size vs IC50 (CMV)




FIG. 18

REP 2004 vs HIV




FIG. 19a

REP 2006 vs HIV




FIG. 19b

REP 2004 vs MT4 lymphocytes




FIG. 19c

REP 2006 vs MT4 lymphocytes




FIG. 19d

Oligo size vs IC50 (HIV)




FIG. 20

Amprenavir (Agenerase™)




FIG. 21a

Indinavir (Crixivan™)




FIG. 21b

Lopinavir (Kaletra™)




FIG. 21c

Saquinavir (Fortovase™)





FIG. 21d

REP 2003



REP 2004




FIG. 21f

REP 2006




FIG. 21g

REP 2007




FIG. 21h

Drug	IC50 (uM)
REP 2003	4.01
REP 2004	0.065
REP 2006	0.014
REP 2007	0.015
Amprenavir	0.016
Indinavir	0.006
Lopinavir	0.004
Saquinavir	0.003

FIG. 22a

Oligo size vs IC50 (HIV-1)




FIG. 22b

Amprenavir (Agenerase TM) Patient. 02-136823-1C0-0-AMP - Ref. CNDO-0000092947-038-AMP




FIG. 23a

Indinavir (Crixivan™)




FIG. 23b




FIG. 23c

Saquinavir (Fortovase™)




FIG. 23d

REP 2003




FIG. 23e

REP 2004




FIG. 23f

REP 2006




FIG. 23g

REP 2007




FIG. 23h

	IC50 (uM)		Fold change
Drug	HIV-1 NL4-3	HIV-1 MRDC4	in IC50
REP 2003	4.01	3.69	0.92
REP 2004	0.065	0.046	0.71
REP 2006	0.014	0.014	1.00
REP 2007	0.015	0.013	0.87
Amprenavir	0.017	0.065	3.82
Indinavir	0.006	0.08	13.33
Lopinavir	0.004	0.096	24.00
Saquinavir	0.003	0.006	2.00

FIG. 24

REP 2004 vs RSV




FIG. 25a

REP 2006 vs RSV




FIG. 25b

REP 2007 vs RSV




FIG. 25c

Ribavirin vs RSV




FIG. 25d

REP 2004 vs Hep2 EC ceils




FIG. 25e

REP 2006 vs Hep2 EC cells




FIG. 25f

REP 2007 vs Hep2 EC cells

120
100
80
60
20
-4.5
-3.5
-2.5
-1.5
-0.5
log [drug] (uM)

FIG. 25g

Ribavirin vs Hep2 EC cells




FIG. 25h

Oligo size vs IC50 (RSV)




FIG. 26

REP 2006 vs COX B2




FIG. 27a

REP 2006 vs LLC-MK2 cells




FIG. 27b

FP Serum Interaction test with PS-ODN randomers of increasing size baseline (unbound bait): 86mP





FIG. 28a

REP2006 delivery with DOTAP in 293A cells over time (50% serum)



Competition test with REP 2005 encapsulated with DOTAP




FIG. 28b

REP2005 delivery with cytofectin in 293A cells over time

(50% serum)

FIG. 28d

CYT 24h

REP 2008 cu 6h REP 2008 cu 24h

0.00E+00

93

FIG. 28c

REP 2006 cyl 1h REP 2006 cyl 2h REP 2006 cyl 4h. REP 2006 cyl 5h REP 2006 cyl 6h

REP 2006 cyt 24h

REP 2006 cyt 3h





FIG. 28e






FIG. 29a

Bait size versus bait polarization (HIV-1)




FIG. 29b

Bait size versus bait polarization (RSV)




FIG. 29c

Oligo competitor size vs bait competition (HSV-1)





FIG. 30a

Oligo competitor size vs bait competition (HIV-1)



Oligo competitor size vs bait competition (RSV)




FIG. 30c









FIG. 31

Bait size vs p24 binding



Bait size vs gp41 binding





Cellular Uptake of REP 2004-FL




FIG. 34




FIG. 35a




FIG. 35b




FIG. 35c

REPLICOR compounds versus Vaccinia




FIG. 36

SEQUENCE COMPOSITION VS ANTI-HSV EFFICACY




FIG. 37a

Effect of sequence composition on efficiacy against HSV-1




FIG. 37b

This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning Operations and is not part of the Official Record

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

□ BLACK BORDERS
□ IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES
□ FADED TEXT OR DRAWING
□ BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING
□ SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES
□ COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS
□ GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS
□ LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT
□ REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

☐ OTHER:

As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.